

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The non-final Office Action dated May 8, 2003 has been received and its content carefully reviewed.

By this Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10 and 11. No new matter has been added. Applicant affirms the provisional election of Group I, claims 1-11 made telephonically by Applicant's representative, Rebecca G. Rudich, on April 22, 2003. Claims 1-19 are pending in the application with claims 12-19 being withdrawn from consideration as drawn to a non-elected species. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested based upon the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,144,435, issued to Yokoyama et al ("Yokoyama"). Applicant traverses the rejection because Yokoyama fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Yokoyama fails to teach or suggest an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having, among other features, "a plurality of common electrodes and data electrodes configured to apply an electric field parallel to the first substrate to the liquid crystal layer; and at least one dummy pattern overlapping at least one portion of the data lines", as recited in amended, independent claim 1.

Yokoyama discloses a liquid crystal device for use in, e.g., a display apparatus for displaying images including characters and/or figures, particularly a liquid crystal device using a chiral smectic liquid crystal suitable for full-color display and a liquid crystal device having a stripe electrode structure suitable for a simple matrix driving (Col. 1, lines 7-13). The Yokoyama disclosure includes transparent electrodes 6a and 6b and auxiliary electrodes 7a and 7b that are "preferably formed on the entire surface of the transparent electrodes 6a and 6b" (Col. 10, lines 59-63). Applicant respectfully notes that in FIGs 3 and 4, the common electrode 6a is formed on the first substrate 1a, the data electrode 6b is formed on the second substrate 1b, and the liquid crystal layer is formed between the first and second substrate. Thus, the electric field

applied to the first substrate is vertical, not parallel as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Further, FIG. 13A shows a group of dummy electrodes 41 separated from a group of drive electrodes 31 (comprising electrodes 6b and 7b) formed on the second substrate (See, Col. 10, lines 1-4 and Col. 11, lines 1-14); and FIG. 11 includes an exposed check portion 33 for inspection of a short circuit (a portion of which the transparent electrode 6b is not coated with the auxiliary electrode 7b, which ordinarily covers an entire transparent electrode 6b in this portion) to expose the transparent electrode 6 surface in a prescribed region (Col. 11, lines 1-9 and claim 24). Applicant notes the dummy electrode 41 may be formed in the peripheral region other than the active region to measure an electrode resistance without adversely affecting drive electrodes (See, Col. 9, line 66 - Col. 10, line 2), and the data line is formed in the active region. Therefore, the dummy electrode 41 cannot be overlapped with the data line, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Since Yokoyama fails to teach or suggest "a plurality of common electrodes and data electrodes configured to apply an electric field parallel to the first substrate to the liquid crystal layer and at least one dummy pattern overlapping at least one portion of the data lines", as recited in claim 1 of the present application, Yokoyama does not anticipate independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-11. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

Application No.: 09/940,544
Amendment dated August 8, 2003
Reply to Office Action of May 8, 2003

Docket No.: 8733.497.00-US

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 8, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant